

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Latasha Boyd,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	Civil Action No. 7:23-cv-4236-BHH
v.)	
)	
United States Corporation, Spartanburg)	
Municipalities Corporation, Spartanburg)	
Sheriff Department, Jerome Rice, John)	<u>ORDER</u>
Harris, Chuck Wright, Ms. Petrie,)	
Beauvier, Jeremy R. Ward, Paul R.,)	
Brian Gotes Ezzelarb, Josie Jones,)	
Dana Lyles, Yvette McClinton, Debbie)	
Evans, Meldrika Ganzaroli, Erick M.)	
Barbare, Brittany Kelly, Jamia Foster,)	
Chuck Bagwell, Tonya Kirkland, April)	
Jeter, Caleb Loring, Derrick S. Wilkey,)	
Sr.,)	
Defendants.)	
)	

This matter is before the Court upon Plaintiff Latasha Boyd's ("Plaintiff") pro se complaint against the above-named Defendants. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(d), D.S.C., the matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge for preliminary determinations.

After reviewing Plaintiff's complaint, the Magistrate Judge issued a report and recommendation ("Report") on August 29, 2023, outlining the issues and recommending that the Court summarily dismiss this action as frivolous pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) and without issuance and service of process. The Magistrate Judge further recommends that the Court decline to give Plaintiff the opportunity to amend her complaint because this is at least the sixth action filed by Plaintiff raising nearly identical, frivolous claims, and amendment would therefore be futile. (See ECF No. 9 and 10, n. 3.) Attached

to the Magistrate Judge's Report was a notice advising Plaintiff of the right to file written objections to the Report within fourteen days of being served with a copy. To date, no objections have been filed.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to the Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The Court is charged with making a *de novo* determination only of those portions of the Report to which specific objections are made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In the absence of specific objections, the Court reviews the matter only for clear error. *See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that "in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must 'only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.'" (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee's note)).

Here, because Plaintiff has not filed objections to the Report, the Court has reviewed the record, the applicable law, and the findings and recommendations of the Magistrate Judge for clear error. After review, the Court finds no clear error and fully agrees with the Magistrate Judge's analysis. Accordingly, the Court **adopts and specifically incorporates** the Magistrate Judge's Report (ECF No. 9), and the Court **dismisses this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B) without issuance and service of process.**

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/Bruce H. Hendricks
United States District Judge

September 20, 2023
Charleston, South Carolina